

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 stand rejected. Claims 1-28 remain pending in this patent application. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the remarks set forth below. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments herein to this patent application do not add new matter to it.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Terasawa et al., US Patent Number 6,147,714 (hereinafter Terasawa).

CLAIM 1

Applicants respectfully contend that Terasawa fails to teach or suggest subject matter recited in newly amended independent Claim 1. For instance, newly amended Claim 1 recites in part (emphasis added):

receiving an input regarding an appearance of said display device, said input is provided by said display device;

Applicants respectfully assert that Terasawa does not teach or suggest receiving an input regarding an appearance of a display device that is provided by the display device as recited in amended Claim 1. Since Terasawa fails to teach or suggest at least one element specifically recited in amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully contend that Terasawa cannot anticipate nor render obvious amended Claim 1. Based on the above rationale, Applicants respectfully submit that newly amended

independent Claim 1 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Terasawa.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit amended Claim 1 is allowable over Terasawa.

CLAIM 14

Applicants respectfully contend that Terasawa fails to teach or suggest subject matter recited in newly amended independent Claim 14. For instance, newly amended Claim 14 recites in part (emphasis added):

determining if said display device provides an input of a display characteristic of said display device;
prompting via a message to provide display information of said display device, if said display device does not provide said input;

Applicants respectfully assert that Terasawa does not teach or suggest the determining as explicitly recited in amended Claim 14. Moreover, Applicants respectfully contend that Terasawa fails to teach or suggest the prompting as specifically recited in amended Claim 14. Since Terasawa fails to teach or suggest at least two elements specifically recited in amended Claim 14, Applicants respectfully contend that Terasawa cannot anticipate nor render obvious amended Claim 14. Based on the above rationale, Applicants respectfully submit that newly amended independent Claim 14 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Terasawa. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit amended Claim 14 is allowable over Terasawa.

CLAIM 27

Applicants respectfully contend that Terasawa fails to teach or suggest subject matter recited in newly amended independent Claim 27. For instance, newly amended Claim 27 recites in part (emphasis added):

determining if said display device provides an input of a display characteristic of said display device;
prompting via a message to provide display information of said display device, if said display device does not provide said input;
selecting a portion of said block of text-based data to be displayed on said display device based on a display characteristic default value stored in memory, if no display characteristic input received in response to said prompting;

Applicants respectfully assert that Terasawa does not teach or suggest the determining as explicitly recited in amended Claim 27. Moreover, Applicants respectfully contend that Terasawa fails to teach or suggest the prompting as specifically recited in amended Claim 27. Applicants respectfully assert that Terasawa does not teach or suggest the selecting as explicitly recited in amended Claim 27. Since Terasawa fails to teach or suggest at least three elements specifically recited in amended Claim 27, Applicants respectfully contend that Terasawa cannot anticipate nor render obvious amended Claim 27. Based on the above rationale, Applicants respectfully submit that newly amended independent Claim 27 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Terasawa. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit amended Claim 27 is allowable over Terasawa.

CLAIM 3

Applicants respectfully assert that the subject matter of newly amended dependent Claim 3 of the present application is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Terasawa based on the same rationale discussed above for amended independent Claim 1 from which Claim 3 depends.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully contend that Terasawa fails to teach or suggest subject matter recited in amended Claim 3. For instance, amended Claim 3 recites in part (emphasis added):

wherein said selecting comprises comparing said input to a predetermined threshold value stored in memory.

Applicants respectfully contend that Terasawa does not teach or suggest the selecting which includes comparing the input to a predetermined threshold value stored in memory as specifically recited in amended Claim 3. Since Terasawa fails to teach or suggest at least one element specifically recited in amended Claim 3, Applicants respectfully contend that Terasawa cannot anticipate nor render obvious amended Claim 3. Based on the above rationale, Applicants respectfully submit that newly amended Claim 3 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Terasawa. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit amended Claim 3 is allowable over Terasawa.

CLAIM 10

Applicants respectfully assert that the subject matter of newly amended dependent Claim 10 of the present application is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Terasawa based on the same rationale discussed above for amended Claims 1 and 3 from which Claim 10 depends.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully assert that Terasawa does not teach or suggest subject matter recited in amended Claim 10. For instance, newly amended Claim 10 recites in part (emphasis added):

wherein said input is an aspect ratio of said display device, a resolution of said display device, or a display size of said display device.

Applicants respectfully contend that Terasawa does not teach or suggest the selecting which includes comparing an aspect ration, a resolution, or a display size of the display device to a predetermined threshold value stored in memory as specifically recited in amended Claim 10. Since Terasawa fails to teach or suggest at least one element specifically recited in amended Claim 10, Applicants respectfully contend that Terasawa cannot anticipate nor render obvious amended Claim 10.

Based on the above rationale, Applicants respectfully submit that newly amended Claim 10 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Terasawa. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit amended Claim 10 is allowable over Terasawa.

CLAIM 13

Applicants respectfully contend that the subject matter of newly amended dependent Claim 13 of the present application is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Terasawa based on the same rationale discussed above for amended independent Claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully contend that Terasawa fails to teach or suggest subject matter recited in amended Claim 13. For instance, newly amended Claim 13 recites in part (emphasis added):

wherein said formatting comprises implementing vertical compression of said portion of said block of text-based data, wherein said frame image comprises a blacked-out top region.

Applicants respectfully contend that Terasawa does not teach or suggest the frame image includes a blacked-out top region as specifically recited in amended Claim 13. Since Terasawa fails to teach or suggest at least one element specifically recited in amended Claim 13, Applicants respectfully contend that Terasawa cannot anticipate nor render obvious amended Claim 13. Based on the above rationale, Applicants respectfully submit that newly amended Claim 13 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Terasawa. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit amended Claim 13 is allowable over Terasawa.

CLAIM 16

Applicants respectfully assert that the subject matter of newly amended dependent Claim 16 of the present application is not anticipated nor rendered

obvious by Terasawa based on the same rationale discussed above for amended independent Claim 14 from which Claim 16 depends.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully contend that Terasawa fails to teach or suggest subject matter recited in amended Claim 16. For instance, amended Claim 16 recites in part (emphasis added):

wherein said selecting comprises comparing said display characteristic to a predetermined threshold value stored in memory.

Applicants respectfully contend that Terasawa does not teach or suggest the selecting which includes comparing the display characteristic to a predetermined threshold value stored in memory as specifically recited in amended Claim 16. Since Terasawa fails to teach or suggest at least one element specifically recited in amended Claim 16, Applicants respectfully contend that Terasawa cannot anticipate nor render obvious amended Claim 16. Based on the above rationale, Applicants respectfully submit that newly amended Claim 16 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Terasawa. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit amended Claim 16 is allowable over Terasawa.

CLAIM 17

Applicants respectfully assert that the subject matter of newly amended dependent Claim 17 of the present application is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Terasawa based on the same rationale discussed above for amended Claims 14 and 16 from which Claim 17 depends.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that Terasawa does not teach or suggest subject matter recited in amended Claim 17. For instance, newly amended Claim 17 recites in part (emphasis added):

wherein said display characteristic is an aspect ratio of said display device, a resolution of said display device, or a display size of said display device.

Applicants respectfully contend that Terasawa does not teach or suggest the selecting which includes comparing an aspect ration, a resolution, or a display size of the display device to a predetermined threshold value stored in memory as specifically recited in amended Claim 17. Since Terasawa fails to teach or suggest at least one element specifically recited in amended Claim 17, Applicants respectfully contend that Terasawa cannot anticipate nor render obvious amended Claim 17. Based on the above rationale, Applicants respectfully submit that newly amended Claim 17 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Terasawa. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit amended Claim 17 is allowable over Terasawa.

CLAIM 25

Applicants respectfully assert that the subject matter of newly amended dependent Claim 25 of the present application is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Terasawa based on the same rationale discussed above for amended independent Claim 14 from which Claim 25 depends.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully contend that Terasawa fails to teach or suggest subject matter recited in amended Claim 25. For instance, amended Claim 25 recites in part (emphasis added):

formatting comprises implementing vertical compression of said portion of said block of text-based data, wherein said frame image comprises a blacked-out top region.

Applicants respectfully contend that Terasawa does not teach or suggest the frame image includes a blacked-out top region as specifically recited in amended Claim 25. Since Terasawa fails to teach or suggest at least one element specifically recited in amended Claim 25, Applicants respectfully contend that Terasawa cannot anticipate nor render obvious amended Claim 25. Based on the above rationale, Applicants respectfully submit that newly amended Claim 25 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Terasawa. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit amended Claim 25 is allowable over Terasawa.

CLAIM 26

Applicants respectfully contend that the subject matter of newly amended dependent Claim 26 of the present application is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Terasawa based on the same rationale discussed above for amended independent Claim 14 from which Claim 26 depends.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully contend that Terasawa fails to teach or suggest subject matter recited in amended Claim 26. For instance, amended Claim 26 recites in part (emphasis added):

receiving a font type and font size for said block of text-based data, in response to said prompting.

Applicants respectfully contend that Terasawa does not teach or suggest the receiving a font type and font size for the block of text-based data, in response to the prompting as specifically recited in amended Claim 26. Since Terasawa fails to teach or suggest at least one element specifically recited in amended Claim 26, Applicants respectfully contend that Terasawa cannot anticipate nor render obvious amended Claim 26. Based on the above rationale, Applicants respectfully submit that newly amended Claim 26 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Terasawa. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit amended Claim 26 is allowable over Terasawa.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of rejected Claims 1-28.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: MAY 28, 2004



Thomas M. Catale
Registration No.: 46,434

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

Voice: (408) 938-9060
Facsimile: (408) 938-9069